

# CALIFORNIA WATER QUALITY MONITORING COUNCIL

## Council Meeting Notes

Wednesday, February 10, 2010 – 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM

Large Conference Room  
Southern California Coastal Water Research Project (SCCWRP)  
3535 Harbor Blvd., Suite 110, Costa Mesa



### Monitoring Council Members in attendance:

Jonathan Bishop	Dale Hoffman-Floerke	Steven Steinberg
Sarge Green	Armand Ruby	Stephen Weisberg

### Monitoring Council Alternates in attendance:

Mike Connor	Val Connor (phone)	Thomas Lyons
-------------	--------------------	--------------

### Others in attendance or on the phone:

Edward Belden, LASGRWC	Jon Marshack, SWRCB, OIMA
Brock Bernstein, Consultant to SWRCB, OIMA	Dick Maynard, Trout Unlimited
Carol Boland, City of San Jose (phone)	Shelly Moore, SCCWRP
John Borkovich, SWRCB, DWQ, GAMA (phone)	Kristy Morris, LASGRWC
Lilian Busse, San Diego RWQCB (phone)	Alex Steele, LACSD
James Giannopoulos, SWRCB, DWQ (phone)	Eric Stein, SCCWRP
Karen Larsen, SWRCB, OIMA	Martha Sutula, SCCWRP
Brian Lewis, DTSC	Peter Williams, IBM (phone)
Phil Markle, LACSD	

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>INTRODUCTIONS AND HOUSEKEEPING</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	1) Introductions 2) Review notes from December 7, 2009 Council meeting 3) Review agenda for today's meeting	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	a) Approve December 7, 2009 Monitoring Council meeting notes b) Adjust today's agenda, as needed	
<b>Attachments:</b>	<a href="#">Notes from December 7, 2009 Council meeting</a>	
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Jon Marshack	<a href="mailto:jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (916) 341-5514
<b>Notes:</b>	Minutes – Item 4, need for process and mechanism for timely and accurate updating of data should be included as part of the discussion.	
<b>Decisions:</b>	Minutes approved with one comment (above).	

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES</b>	

<b>Purpose:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) New Co-Chair from the Natural Resources Agency (all)</li> <li>b) Agriculture representative on the Monitoring Council</li> <li>c) Briefing with Cal/EPA Secretary Linda Adams (Jonathan Bishop &amp; Jon Marshack)</li> <li>d) State budget update (Jonathan Bishop)</li> <li>e) Outreach to state government organizations update (all)</li> </ul>	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	a) Information and comment	
<b>Background:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) As of February 3, Joe Grindstaff, Monitoring Council Co-Chair from the California Natural Resources Agency and his alternate Terry Macaulay will become employees of the Delta Stewardship Council. Because the Delta Stewardship Council is independent of the Natural Resources Agency, Joe and Terry can no longer represent the Natural Resources Agency on the Monitoring Council. Dale Hoffman-Floerke, Chief of the Division of Environmental Services at the Department of Water Resources has been named as the new Co-Chair from Natural Resources.</li> <li>b) In April 2009 Parry Klassen indicated that he was stepping down as the agriculture representative on the Monitoring Council, due to other time commitments.</li> <li>c) At previous meetings, the Monitoring Council agreed that the two agency secretaries should be briefed on the direction of the draft comprehensive monitoring program strategy prior to briefing and seeking input from key legislators (e.g., SB 1070 authors Senators Kehoe and Alquist). Secretary Adams also asked for a briefing upon having received the Monitoring Council's 2009 Annual Progress Report. Cal/EPA Secretary Linda Adams was briefed by Jonathan Bishop and Jon Marshack on January 21. Secretary Adams was pleased with the direction that the Monitoring Council was taking and the Safe-to-Swim and Safe-to-Eat internet portals that were demonstrated in the briefing.</li> </ul>	
<b>Attachments:</b>	a) <a href="#">2009 Annual Progress Report</a> (final version)	
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Jon Marshack	<a href="mailto:jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (916) 341-5514
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>New co-chair (Dale Hoffman-Floerke, DWR) introduced herself. Jon asked for recommendations for alternate.</p> <p>Introduced Tom Lyons as new alternate to Linda Sheehan (Public Member).</p> <p>Discussed process and prospects for ag rep. Announced request for adding Mike Connor as rep for POTWs.</p> <p>Secretary Adams Briefing – The briefing was well received by Secretary Adams and her staff. Invited Jon to brief the BDO Execs on the My Water Quality portals, which also was well received. Also discussed briefing with Secretary of Resources, Lester Snow. Dale will be taking lead on scheduling that briefing. Subsequently, the authors of the legislation will be briefed. Mentioned that Linda Sheehan also should be involved as one of the key sponsors of the legislation.</p> <p>State Budget Update – Democrat budget proposal out yesterday. Negotiations and hearings are just beginning. Do not anticipate any impacts to the WQMC</p>	

	<p>with the current proposals. Resources Agency also anticipating handling 5% personnel cut through attrition and vacancies without layoffs or a hiring freeze. Jonathan mentioned that bond funds are being unfrozen as well.</p> <p>Outreach to other State Government Organizations – 1) Steve Weisberg questioned what is our relationship to the National Water Quality Monitoring Council? Jon indicated that we will be presenting a poster on the CWQMC and the portals at the national meeting in April. We will be attempting to get the portal presentation switched to an oral presentation. Further discussion was whether the Council wants to push to have a member on the national council. 2) Steve mentioned that we should outreach to other state's Councils to exchange experiences, information, initiatives (e.g., Maryland). Suggested their next annual meeting could be a compare and contrast councils. Ohio, Florida also have active councils. 3) Questioned when to bring the Council into state activities (i.e., data collection for assessing harmful algal blooms). Suggested ponying up funds to assist with organizing workshops such as those that the OPC leads. Discussion culminated in the recommendation that the Council develop an outreach plan to guide these types of decisions.</p> <p>Announced new logo for the Council.</p>
<b>Action Items:</b>	Future agenda item to develop outreach plan.

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL DATA EXCHANGE NETWORK</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	a) Update Council on the CEDEN progress and short and long-term vision for the system b) Demonstrate the website and simple query tool mock-up of the CEDEN system	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Review and comment	
<b>Background:</b>	CEDEN is a system designed to facilitate integration and sharing of data collected by many different participants. It is a growing statewide cooperative effort of various groups involved in the water and environmental resources of the State of California. This network is open to federal, state, county and private organizations interested in sharing data throughout the state. The purpose of the CEDEN network is to allow the exchange and integration of water and environmental data between groups and to make it accessible to the public.	
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Karen Larsen	<a href="mailto:klarsen@waterboards.ca.gov">klarsen@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (916) 319-9769
<b>Notes:</b>	CEDEN has two main tasks: (1) feeding data to the internet portals as pre-defined queries and (2) providing ad hoc query tools via the CEDEN website for agency staff and others.  Noted need to ensure that queries requested in the My Water Quality portal should seamlessly query the ad hoc CEDEN tools (no need to re-enter query parameters).  Steve Steinberg noted that Humboldt State would be interested in serving as a	

	<p>data center for the north state.</p> <p>Jon mentioned that the DWR and other Resources Agency data need to be linked (cross-walked) into CEDEN.</p> <p>Some discussion of how to capture the grant project data ensued.</p> <p>Concern was expressed about how to ensure key data sources don't fall through the cracks because the RDCs don't know about them or don't have the capacity to serve them. Comment was that it is the Council's job to ensure that data do not get missed.</p>
--	---

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>SAFE TO DRINK GROUNDWATER PORTAL</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	Review a mock-up of a new Safe-to-Drink portal focusing on groundwater and based on the GeoTracker GAMA (Groundwater Ambient Monitoring Program) database and web-based map tool.
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Approval of the portal mock-up and direction to produce a working draft portal
<b>Background:</b>	<p>GeoTracker GAMA presents a very different perspective on interaction with the Monitoring Council than do the other three initial work group and portal development efforts. The development of GeoTracker GAMA is governed by its own statute, <a href="#">AB 599, the Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001</a>. AB 599 required that the State Water Board, in coordination with an Interagency Task Force (ITF) and a Public Advisory Committee (PAC) integrate existing monitoring programs and design new program elements, as necessary, to establish a comprehensive statewide groundwater quality monitoring program. The internet accessible GeoTracker GAMA database and its web interface were developed as a result of AB 599 that specified its database be "compatible with GeoTracker." To meet these legal requirements, State Water Board Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) staff and its software-as-a-service contractor (EcolInteractive) had a well established system prior to the development of the Monitoring Council's initial recommendations. GAMA staff believes that the GeoTracker GAMA database and its associated information can be successfully shared in a beneficial manner by making best use of existing GAMA database functionality with some integration into the Monitoring Council's portal architecture.</p> <p>In May 2009, John Borkovich made a <a href="#">presentation on GeoTracker GAMA</a>. The Monitoring Council asked that a more detailed mock-up of a Safe-to-Drink portal be developed for review and approval. The Council asked that the portal revolve around major questions and present higher level (e.g., statewide) statistics based on the available data. Specific recommendations were included in item #4 of the <a href="#">May 22, 2009 meeting notes</a>.</p>
<b>Attachments:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <a href="#">AB 599, the Groundwater Quality Monitoring Act of 2001</a></li> <li>b) <a href="#">May 22, 2009 Monitoring Council meeting notes</a> (see item #4)</li> <li>c) <a href="#">Safe-to-Drink Groundwater portal mockup presentation</a></li> </ul>

<b>Contact Person:</b>	John Borkovich	jborkovich@waterboards.ca.gov, (916) 341-5779
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>How would the GT GAMA show statewide assessment information? For example, number of wells that exceed a specific MCL statewide. Response, clarify that the data available are results from untreated water and that CDPH is the agency that reports on the “Safe to Drink” question.</p> <p>Jon Bishop pointed out that this is a different approach to the portals because it was something that already was developed to address requirements established before the Council existed. There may be need for additional assessment tools that have yet to be developed.</p> <p>The Council supports using existing systems (such as GT GAMA) to support the needs for displaying information through the My Water Quality portals.</p> <p>Steve Weisberg mentioned the need for information about pharmaceuticals in the drinking water.</p>	
<b>Decisions:</b>	Council directed staff to develop a working draft of the “Safe to Drinking, Groundwater” portal.	
<b>Action Items:</b>	<p>a) Add statewide assessment statistics, e.g. as canned queries generated by GT GAMA.</p> <p>b) Add color key in legend.</p>	

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>WETLAND PORTAL</b>
<b>Purpose:</b>	Demonstration of a draft wetland ecosystem health portal based on the Wetland Tracker database and web tool of the California Wetland Monitoring Workgroup (CWMW).
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	<p>a) Approval for public release of the wetland portal.</p> <p>b) Agreement that portals developed from pre-existing workgroup websites may have a look and feel that differs from already approved and published web Monitoring Council web portals, as long as specific concepts and elements are retained.</p>
<b>Background:</b>	<p>The CWMW has developed a proposed California Wetlands web portal, based on the workgroup’s existing Wetland Tracker database and website. The portal would link from aquatic ecosystem health main page that divides this topic along water body types. A mock-up of the wetland portal was presented to the Monitoring Council in May 2009. See item #5 of the <a href="#">May 22, 2009 Monitoring Council meeting notes</a>.</p> <p>The California Wetlands portal may be viewed at <a href="http://www.californiawetlands.net/">http://www.californiawetlands.net/</a>.</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	<p>a) <a href="#">May 22, 2009 Monitoring Council meeting notes</a> (see item #5)</p> <p>b) <a href="#">California Wetlands portal demonstration introduction</a></p>

<b>Contact Person:</b>	Martha Sutula	<a href="mailto:marthas@sccwrp.org">marthas@sccwrp.org</a> , (714) 755-3222
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>How widely accepted widespread is CRAM? It is calibrated and developed for statewide use. Agencies participating in the wetland monitoring workgroup are endorsing the use of CRAM as a standard method. Specifically, wetlands policy is in process of peer reviewing CRAM for use by Water Boards. Trying to form a new workgroup to expand the use to the Central Valley (depressional wetlands).</p> <p>Does the site meet ADA requirements (e.g., font size, colors)? Is this site allowed to be publicly released without ADA compliance?</p> <p>Wetland type colors in the maps are not present in the legend, which displays project colors.</p> <p>Should most recently mapped wetlands be red and oldest be green (seems counter-intuitive).</p> <p>What is the management goal that this portal and information available in it serving? What do we want the public to take away from this information? Meeting the “no net loss” goal stated by the Governor’s office. The Council doesn’t necessarily have to have a goal or management question that will be answered. Some of the background information speaks to the question “why do I care”? One of the goals of the portals is to force these questions to be asked.</p> <p>Steve requested a report that highlights the gaps in knowledge, etc., and recommendations for what needs to be done to fill the gaps or answer questions that currently cannot be answered (possibly include in the strategy as a policy for the Council).</p> <p>Suggested asking the question “what isn’t here that you would like to see?” There already is the capability to provide feedback on the website – may need to be more specific.</p> <p>The Council’s question-driven structure has improved the portal to highlight where additional information is needed.</p> <p>Add Central Valley Joint Venture data, which is already in digital format.</p>	
<b>Decisions:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Council supports releasing the portal to the public after addressing some of the issues raised above.</li> <li>b) The Monitoring Council’s strategy document should include a requirement that each workgroup should report to the agencies on the following items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) What can we do well?</li> <li>ii) What can we not do well?</li> <li>iii) What needs to be done to address the shortcomings?</li> </ul> </li> <li>c) Message to legislature: Monitoring Council’s structure has caused the Wetlands workgroup to re-focus so as to be able to answer questions that people need to know.</li> <li>d) Web portal guidelines should include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Ask the public what they want to see that may not be on the portal, e.g., “Did this portal/page answer your question?”</li> <li>ii) When a portal links to a web page or document that is outside of its</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	



	<p>structure, a new window should be opened to display the information.</p> <p>iii) Capture frequent comments and responses on web portals.</p> <p>iv) Portals should highlight where monitoring projects exist but are currently being compiled.</p>
<b>Action Items:</b>	<p>a) Agendize discussion of ADA requirements at a future MC meeting.</p> <p>b) Email Jon comments on the press release by next week.</p>

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>6</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>WETLAND MONITORING PROGRAM STRATEGY</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	Presentation of a <a href="#">wetland monitoring program strategy</a> proposed by the CWMW.	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	<p>a) Agreement in concept to the proposed wetland strategy</p> <p>b) Approval to incorporate the wetland monitoring program strategy into the Monitoring Council's comprehensive monitoring program strategy as a prime example of the degree of coordination that can be achieved by the Monitoring Council's theme-based workgroups.</p>	
<b>Background:</b>	<p>At the May 2009 Monitoring Council meeting, Eric Stein gave a <a href="#">presentation</a> on the work of the CWMW to develop a wetland monitoring strategy, which synthesizes recommendations for establishing a coordinated wetland monitoring program for the State. The CWMW asked that their wetland monitoring strategy be incorporated into the Monitoring Council's comprehensive strategy to achieve broader agency and stakeholder buy-in prior to State Water Board adoption of a California wetland monitoring program, as part of the wetland protection policy. At the meeting, the Monitoring Council agreed in general with CWMW wetland monitoring strategy development concept.</p>	
<b>Attachments:</b>	<p>a) <a href="#">Tenets of a State Wetland and Riparian Monitoring Program</a></p> <p>b) <a href="#">May 22, 2009 Monitoring Council meeting notes</a> (see item #5)</p> <p>c) <a href="#">Wetland monitoring strategy presentation</a></p>	
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Eric Stein	erics@sccwrp.org, (714) 755-3233
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>Discussion focused on how to fund the monitoring that is needed as identified in the monitoring strategy. This discussion reached beyond the issue of wetland monitoring.</p> <p>Estimate \$10M spent on wetland monitoring. There are about 1500-2000 permittees spending approximately \$200K on monitoring/mapping of wetlands. Made the point that the current way that monitoring is done/funded is inefficient and could be a huge source of funding for monitoring wetlands.</p> <p>Council needs to discuss how they interface with this work and to what degree they participate in obtaining funding or support, etc.</p> <p>Jonathan suggested that a portion of all required monitoring be directed toward a regional approach to monitoring – since a line item for monitoring is not likely in</p>	

	the future.
<b>Decisions:</b>	<p>a) Monitoring Council supports the structure and approach described in the report with the exception of the potential funding strategies, which should be replaced with a discussion that the workgroup will work with the Council to develop funding opportunities. The Monitoring Council's role is not to endorse the detailed content of the report, which is the purview of the workgroup with its appropriate representation and expertise.</p> <p>b) Council needs to take the charge of identifying an approach to funding the whole effort including all of the workgroup efforts and infrastructure, etc.</p> <p>c) Council strongly endorses this document (with the emphasis that other workgroups should strive to produce similar frameworks to guide them).</p>

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>7</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>GUIDELINES FOR WORKGROUPS AND WEB PORTAL DEVELOPMENT</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	Review draft guidelines	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	<p>a) Review and comment</p> <p>b) Agreement to include within the comprehensive monitoring program strategy.</p>	
<b>Background:</b>	<p>At the September 27, 2009 meeting, then Monitoring Council tasked Jon Marshack with developing draft guidelines for web portal development.</p> <p>An outline of guidelines for workgroup formation and function has been added to assist in the formation of new workgroups or the refocusing of existing workgroups to facilitate portal development and associated coordination of monitoring and assessment efforts within their theme.</p>	
<b>Attachments:</b>	<p>a) <a href="#">Draft Guidelines for Web Portal Development</a></p> <p>b) <a href="#">Workgroup Formation &amp; Function Outline</a></p>	
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Jon Marshack	<a href="mailto:jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (916) 341-5514
<b>Decisions:</b>	<b><i>Item deferred to future meeting with email exchange of comments</i></b>	
<b>Action Items:</b>	<p>a) Agendize for future meeting.</p> <p>b) Send revised version of guidelines to group for comments.</p>	

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>8</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>COMPREHENSIVE MONITORING PROGRAM STRATEGY</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	Monitoring Council review of draft strategy document	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	<p>a) Agreement on the organization and content of the strategy document</p> <p>b) Agreement on recommendations to be contained in the strategy document</p>	



	c) Confirm schedule for finalizing document	
<b>Background:</b>	<p>The last draft of the strategy was circulated for review in September 2009 was discussed at the September and December 2009 meetings. The draft strategy was discussed in a briefing with Cal/EPA Secretary Linda Adams on January 21, 2010. Concurrence with the direction that the strategy is taking was obtained. Briefings with Natural Resources Secretary Lester Snow and key legislators are planned in order to obtain further concurrence on the direction of the strategy. The Monitoring Council expressed the desire to have such input before finalizing the strategy document for the two agency secretaries.</p> <p>The Monitoring Council agreed at the December 2009 meeting that the SWAMP monitoring and assessment strategy, being updated by the State Water Board staff, will be integrated into the Monitoring Council's strategy as an appendix. Also included will be an updated assessment framework. See item #3 in the notes from the <a href="#">December 7, 2009 Monitoring Council meeting</a>.</p> <p>The Wetland Monitoring Workgroup has submitted a proposed wetland monitoring strategy document (agenda item #6, above) with the hope that it can be appended to and referenced within the comprehensive monitoring strategy document as an example of the progress that can be achieved by a theme-based workgroup.</p> <p>The guidelines for workgroups and for web portal development (agenda item #7, above) are also intended to be incorporated into the comprehensive monitoring program strategy.</p>	
<b>Attachments:</b>	<p>a) <a href="#">Draft Comprehensive Monitoring Program Strategy</a></p> <p>b) <a href="#">December 7, 2009 Monitoring Council meeting notes</a> (see item #3)</p> <p>c) <a href="#">Draft strategy recommendations</a></p>	
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Brock Bernstein	<a href="mailto:brockbernstein@sbcglobal.net">brockbernstein@sbcglobal.net</a> , (805) 646-8369
<b>Notes:</b>	<p>Funding was discussed during earlier items, above.</p> <p>Jon M presented a straw list of recommendations for the strategy.</p> <p>Jon B suggested making a finding that the monitoring approach in California is not working – possibly quote the language in the legislation. Also suggested that each recommendation be linked with an identified problem (i.e., recommendations are solutions to solving the problem).</p> <p>Council expressed discomfort with the recommendation regarding the grant project data because they have not discussed the issues thoroughly yet.</p>	
<b>Decisions:</b>	<p>a) Recommendation #1 (endorse MC vision) should be the main thrust.</p> <p>b) Include funding item in general terms, focusing on added costs of Monitoring Council, workgroups and data infrastructure.</p> <p>c) Strike the grant project recommendation but include a discussion of the issues in the strategy.</p> <p>d) Change “recommendations” to “conclusions/findings” to be clear that these are points that the Council wants to highlight for the Legislature (rather than recommend that the legislature do something).</p>	

	e) Acknowledge that the strategy is not yet comprehensive and is a work in progress.
<b>Action Items:</b>	a) ID staff from Resources Agency that are involved in the existing workgroups. b) Distribute final draft strategy by end of February. Comments due by March 15 <sup>th</sup> . No need to bring back to Monitoring Council meeting to finalize.

<b>ITEM:</b>	<b>9</b>	
<b>Title of Topic:</b>	<b>MEETING WRAP-UP</b>	
<b>Purpose:</b>	a) Summarize meeting b) Plan agenda for next Monitoring Council meeting on April 14, 2010 in Sacramento	
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>	Develop agenda items for April 14 meeting.	
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Jon Marshack	<a href="mailto:jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov">jmarshack@waterboards.ca.gov</a> , (916) 341-5514
<b>Action Items:</b>	April meeting – focus on Resources Agency participation a) Invite key staff to participate in the discussion. b) Discuss “Safe to Eat” portal development as a model for this coordination/collaboration.	

March 11, 2010  
 Approved June 9, 2010